

contradictions on pages 2 and 4 of the office action.

Again, on page 3, the Examiner rejects claims 1-34 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b). However, Applicant had previously cancelled claims 1-19 and added claims 20-39. Therefore, Applicant cannot understand the Examiner's rejection of claims 1-34.

Applicant notes that this is the fourth office action in the case and that there is ongoing objections/rejections by the Examiner that do not appear substantiated on the record.

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner kindly re-issue an appropriate action with the correct claims so that Applicant may adequately respond to the rejections. Applicant also requests that the time for response be re-started so that Applicant is not adversely affected due the errors in the office action that did not result from Applicant's mistakes.

Respectfully,



James C. Wray, Reg. No. 22,693
Meera P. Narasimhan, Reg. No. 40,252
1493 Chain Bridge Road, Suite 300
McLean, Virginia 22101
Tel: (703) 442-4800
Fax: (703) 448-7397

December 10, 2002